TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

BEFORE THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION WASHINGTON, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of:

Maritime Communications/Land Mobile, LLC et

For commission consent to assignment of various authorizations in wireless radio service

EB Docket No. 11-71 0. 20

ORIGINAL

DATE OF HEARING: __May 22, 2012 ____ VOLUME: ___5__

PLACE OF HEARING: __WASHINGTON, D.C. __ PAGES: __520-675_

NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC. 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005 TELEPHONE (202) 234-4433



Before the Federal Communications Commission Washington, D.C. 20554

	-71	
In the Matter of:	:	EB Docket No.
	:	11-71
MARITIME COMMUNICATIONS/LAND,	:	
MOBILE, LLC	:	File No.
	:	EB-09-IH-1751
Participant in Auction No. 61	:	
and Licensee of Various	:	FRN:
Authorizations in the Wireless	:	0013587779
Radio Services	:	
	:	Application
Applicant for Modification of	:	File Nos.
Various Authorizations in the	:	0004030479
Wireless Radio Services	:	0004144435
	:	0004193028
Applicant with ENCANA OIL AND	:	0004193328
GAS (USA), INC.; DUQUESNE	:	0004354053
LIGHT COMPANY, DCP MIDSTREAM;	:	0004309872
JACKSON COUNTY RURAL MEMBERSHIP	:	0004310060
ELECTRONIC COOPERATIVE; PUGET	:	0004314903
SOUND ENERGY, INC.; ENBRIDGE	:	0004315013
ENERGY COMPANY, INC.;	:	0004430505
INTERSTATE POWER AND LIGHT	:	0004417199
COMPANY; WISCONSIN POWER AND	:	0004419431
LIGHT COMPANY; DIXIE ELECTRIC	:	0004422320
MEMBERSHIP CORPORATION, INC.;	:	0004422329
ATLAS PIPELINE-MID CONTINENT,	:	0004507921
LLC; DENTON COUNTY ELECTRIC	:	0004153701
COOPERATIVE, INC., DBA COSERV	:	0004526264
ELECTRIC; AND SOUTHERN	:	0004636537
CALIFORNIA REGIONAL RAIL	:	0004604962
AUTHORITY	:	
	:	
For Commission Consent to the	:	Tuesday
Assignment of Various	:	May 22, 2012
Authorizations in the Wireless	:	_
Radio Service	:	
	:	
	1	

NEAL R. GROSS

VOLUME V

Room A, TW A-363 FCC Headquarters 445 12th Street, S.W. Washington, D.C.

The above-entitled matter came on for prehearing conference, pursuant to notice, at 10:00 a.m.

BEFORE:

THE HONORABLE RICHARD L. SIPPEL Chief Administrative Law Judge

NEAL R. GROSS

APPEARANCES:

On Behalf of Maritime Communications:

ROBERT J. KELLER, Esquire of: Robert J. Keller, P.C. P.O. Box 33428
Washington, D.C. 20033
(202) 223-2100
(202) 223-2121 fax

and

JOHN REARDON, Esquire
of: MCCM, LLC
218 North Lee Street
#318
Alexandria, VA 22314
(601) 427-0048
(601) 427-0050 fax

On Behalf of Warren Havens:

WARREN HAVENS, pro se (via telephone) Berkeley, CA 94705

On Behalf of Pinnacle Wireless:

MATTHEW J. PLACHE, Esquire of: Catalano & Plache, PLLC 3221 M Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20007 (202) 338-3200 (202) 338-1700 fax

August	-Sept	ember.
--------	-------	--------

JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, you're right about the second point, but let's just take things at they are. Now, you said that there was a plan of reorganization filed on the 30th of April. Do the parties have a copy of that? The parties --

MR. KELLER: I believe so. I know this --

MS. KANE: We do, Your Honor. We have reviewed it. And we have serious concerns with it in terms of the impact it might have on a second Thursday filing.

As was explained by Mr. Keller, this plan contemplates assigning the entire portfolio of Maritime's licenses, which are still currently valued at \$42.2 million, to a group of secured creditors that are only owed \$17 million.

We have had this discussion numerous times in prehearing conferences before, but there is a concern that there is

1	no precedent for applying second Thursday when
2	you are assigning greater value to the
3	creditors than what they are owed.
4	MR. HAVENS: The
5	MS. KANE: I'm sorry. Excuse me,
6	Mr. Havens.
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: Mr. Havens?
8	MR. HAVENS: Yes, sir.
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: I've got a button
10	here. I can stop this right now, but I don't
11	want to. Just hang on. Just hang on.
12	Go ahead. Finish, please.
13	MS. KANE: The Bureau is quite
14	concerned that a second Thursday filing based
15	on this plan would not be sufficient. And we
16	have been holding up every other issue in this
17	hearing based on the fact that second Thursday
18	would resolve those issues. But with this
19	kind of plan, we have serious concerns.
20	We know that at previous points,
21	we have talked about a valuation process
22	occurring in the bankruptcy court. We have

heard nothing that there's been any additional
valuation of these licenses. And, in fact, in
their plan, Maritime has continued to stand by
their \$42.2 million assessment that Mr. Keller
has said is inaccurate.

So we're befuddled because we thought there was going to be a valuation processing occurring in the bankruptcy court or that a valuation process should occur in this arena in order to determine whether a second Thursday filing is even possible.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, let me ask
Mr. Keller that question, then. What about
valuation? Is the bankruptcy court involved
in that?

MR. KELLER: Your Honor, I don't believe -- well, first of all, I take issue with the issues, as it were. The rubrics of second Thursday are that the alleged wrongdoers not benefit and that there is benefit to the innocent creditors.

Whether what the innocent

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

creditors receive is a portion of what they have coming to them, all of what they have coming to them, or in this case possibly more than what they have coming to them under the plan does not negate second Thursday. The only issue for second Thursday where an overvalue, if you want to call it that, would be of concern would be to make sure that none of that overvalue gets back to the alleged wrongdoers.

In this particular case, I cannot speak to what the internal bankruptcy law reasons are. I can check with bankruptcy counsel and find out why this particular valuation was used. I suspect because it was the one that was already on file with the court.

But, be that as it may, what I can tell you is that the secured creditors who make up Choctaw are sort of taking a risk here. They're saying, "All right. We're going to forego our claims" of however many

million dollars it is -- I don't know the exact number -- "in exchange for which we will take these assets."

They're also -- it's not just their claims. They're also making good on all of the other claims, all the administrative claims, all the other secured claims, all the unsecured claims. They're undertaking to pull that off.

They're gambling, if you want to call it that. But yes. They certainly do hope that the total value of the portfolio will be more than that, which is why they are willing to take that risk. They have no guarantee of that.

But for second Thursday purposes, it really is irrelevant. It is irrelevant whether the actual value turns out to be half of what the claims, equal to what the claims are, or twice what the claims are worth so long as the innocent creditors do not benefit; and, second, the alleged wrongdoers do not

benefit.

And, furthermore, this is really an issue to be addressed in the context of the second Thursday proposal. Whether this is or is not proper for second Thursday, those are the merits of second Thursday itself.

MR. HAVENS: Can I address this appropriately, sir?

JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I just want to just ask. Let me say my piece. And yes, you will.

It sounds to me like you're asking the Commission to be part of a kind of a gaming procedure here that Choctaw is going to roll the dice on this. If they come up high, that's great.

Now, I don't know what the bottom is. I don't know how they're securing their bottom on this. But it doesn't sound like it's -- to me it sounds like it's got elements of at least some things happening that I would like to know more about.

MR. KELLER: I'm aware of actually
no precedent that says that second Thursday
prohibits selling the assets for more than
they are worth so long as the alleged
wrongdoers are not
JUDGE SIPPEL: It's going to be a
case of first impressions. How do they know
that they are going to be able to get
licenses, I mean, that the Commission is going
to approve the licenses?
MR. KELLER: Well, that's the
whole point of the second Thursday proposal,
is to
JUDGE SIPPEL: They don't
automatically get them.
MR. KELLER: I understand that.
MR. HAVENS: Can I address this,
sir?
JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes, sir. Yes,
sir, Mr. Havens. You have been very patient.
MR. HAVENS: Thank you.

called on the specific matter that Maritime raised with regard to the issue G. Your Honor issued an order that the parties meet a concern, attempt to agree upon what would be the limitation of this for the hearing. That was agreed to. The agreement was it was issue G.

Mr. Keller is blindsiding my companies and myself by getting into other issues in this hearing, including a subsequent argument on second Thursday, when I didn't have any opportunity to prepare with counsel or invite our bankruptcy counsel to be a part of this debate.

So I object to Mr. Keller making an agreement under Your Honor's order on what the limitation would be in this hearing and then flagrantly getting into an argument from second Thursday and discussing the bankruptcy plan, which I believe is improperly characterized, including even what it is.

So I don't know how to -- I mean,

I am being told I am the non-attorney, I am the party who can be out of order. I think Mr. Keller is out of order here. And it is inappropriate in any hearing to agree on one thing, to limitation, to call for a meeting with certain specific issues to be raised, and then to get into an entirely different matter.

I don't know how to participate with or without attorneys when the hearing is called for one thing and then a party is allowed to give substantive arguments.

And I respect Ms. Kane for her views on that. And I think I agree with what she expressed, but this was not a topic today. How could I prepare for it with counsel and bankruptcy counsel if it wasn't to be an issue today?

JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I think if you had a lawyer here, you wouldn't have that problem. I mean, this is just a hearing conference. I mean, yes, I want to know what everybody is prepared to talk about, but I am

not disappointed when sor	mebody says you
know, this bankruptcy issu	ue has been hanging
around for a long time.	We're just simply
getting a status report.	Okay.

MR. HAVENS: If I --

JUDGE SIPPEL: Look, he can make all the arguments he wants. You can make all the arguments you want. You are just in a prehearing conference. There is nothing going to be resolved on arguments.

MR. HAVENS: I just get the -JUDGE SIPPEL: There's no

MR. HAVENS: This wasn't an issue to be discussed today. And it's not just a status report that Mr. Keller is giving. He was making substantive arguments on how the plan he discussed, the chapter 11 plan, should meet the standard as he sees the standard being or the new precedent being for second Thursday.

So unless I knew that would be

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

evidence.

- 1	
1	argued, how can I prepare for that?
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: Look, Mr
3	MS. KANE: Your Honor, maybe I can
4	help.
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: Go ahead, Ms. Kane.
6	Please help me.
7	MS. KANE: Let me try. Maritime
8	filed a report regarding what would be sort of
9	attempts to reach agreement on what would be
10	covered in this prehearing conference in which
11	the parties did agree that at least the issue
12	of issue G and discovery related to issue G
13	would be covered.
14	He did raise the fact in that
15	pleading, which he served on Mr. Havens and I
16	presume on Mr. Havens' other entities'
17	counsel, that he would raise a bankruptcy
18	status issue. So, at least from that
19	perspective, I am actually defending Maritime
20	in here that he has provided notice that this
21	would be a topic for discussion today.

JUDGE SIPPEL: You don't have to

1156	that	terminology.
use	Luat	returnorody.

MR. HAVENS: I understand. I understand the --

JUDGE SIPPEL: No, no. Mr. Havens, you -- now, wait a minute. I interrupted. Ms. Kane is not finished. Just hold off.

MS. KANE: The other issue that we want to at least -- and we don't want to get into a substantive discussion today of second Thursday, but we are concerned that this HDO was released over a year ago. It covers issues that pertain to the qualifications of Maritime and whether it should be entitled to remain a licensee.

And the only basis on which those licenses could be transferred in the absence of an adjudication by Your Honor on those issues is an exception to that. And that is second Thursday. And so the large spectrum of such a second Thursday that Maritime is suggesting flies in the face of the fact that

it	is	an	exception	to	Jefferson	Radio	and
shc	uld	be	narrowly c	ons	trued.		

And we have been holding up all of these other issues on the qualifications of Maritime to hold these licenses and to transfer the licenses in the hopes that second Thursday would resolve those issues.

Our concern is that this plan is not going to be certainly the way it is phrased immediately granted and that we will continue to hold those issues in abeyance ad infinitum until Maritime can provide a plan that actually complies with the narrow construction of second Thursday as an exception to Jefferson Radio.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, you want to respond to that?

MR. KELLER: I only want to say a couple of things. One is, Ms. Kane, thank you. She already said the one thing I was going to say, that in our filing that we made on the report of our negotiations, paragraph

6,	we	did	spec	cif	ical	ly	stat	:e	that	we	woul	d be
pro	ovi	ding	a	r	epor	ct	on	t	he	sta	tus	and
de	velo	opme:	nts	in	the	ba	nkru	pt	cy.			

The only reason I got into anything that might be characterized as substance or merits at all was because the Bureau raised the issue, saying they had problems with the plan and what they were.

JUDGE SIPPEL: All right. Now, are you satisfied with that, Mr. Havens? He did give notice.

MR. HAVENS: No, I'm not, because it was Maritime who called this prehearing because the Bureau has made many filings with regard to Maritime not complying with the obligations of discovery on issue G.

But, Your Honor, I would prefer this prehearing to get to issue G. I don't have anything further to say about that because I don't want to spend time on that issue right now.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, okay. Let's

1	leave it, then. We're not going to hear about
2	it again.
3	I'm sorry. I cut you off, Mr
4	MR. KELLER: No. That's really
5	all I have to say. I mean, I figure, as with
6	other things, I'm sure more will be said in
7	writing about this in the near future.
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: There is no
9	question about that. Now
10	MS. KANE: Your Honor, if we may,
11	where do we stand on whether there will be
12	additional valuation of these licenses?
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: Right now? We're
14	stuck. You know, if you have a theory on
15	this, I don't know what the obligations are
16	for anybody to make a valuation at this point,
17	but I do have some serious questions as to
18	whether the second Thursday can be used in the
19	way that it is being used. I think there is
20	a process problem here, issues of it anyway.
21	I mean, that's where my concern
22	is. I'm trying to avoid getting down into the

depths	s of	what	the	bank	rupt	ccy	court	t is
suppos	ed to	be	doing.	And	d i	f th	ey're	not
intere	ested i	in val	luation	, I w	voul	d lil	ke to	know
why.	Nobod	y is :	raising	it.				

MR. KELLER: I'm not a bankruptcy lawyer, but I believe the bankruptcy court's concern about valuation would just be to make sure that once it's -- I think the bankruptcy court's concern diminishes greatly once they're satisfied that the creditors are satisfied. And this was a plan that was negotiated with all of the secured creditors and the unsecured creditors' committee.

And I will have to speak with bankruptcy counsel. I suspect -- I don't know what the reasons were for using this particular valuation plan. I think it was just to demonstrate that there is at least some reasonable basis for believing that the assets were not to cover the claims.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I would think, though, that in a normal bankruptcy

proceeding, about four years ago, I was in one
to help a nurse who was bankrupt, but, you
know, you list all the assets up. It gets a
value. And that's what the bankruptcy you
know, there wasn't even a hearing, but that is
what is acted upon. And there is verification
under oath or something that this is what the
value is, estimated values or market value,
whatever you want to call it.
There is speculative value. This
thing might be worth \$50 million or it might
be worth \$17 million and you're going to roll
the dice. You know, you might be rich or you
might not be rich. But I don't know what the

MR. KELLER: That's a bankruptcy law issue, Your Honor. And I think if the Bureau --

JUDGE SIPPEL: Right now I'm making it my issue until I get clarification.

MR. KELLER: Well, again, I'm saying that I dispute it. Maybe we're going

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

hell is going on.

1	to have to brief this issue, too, but I
2	dispute that the valuation is really that much
3	of an issue under second Thursday.
4	The issue under second Thursday is
5	not how much the licenses are worth. The
6	issue is whether or not
7	MR. HAVENS: Well, here we go.
8	We're back into the argument.
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: Now, wait a minute,
10	Mr. Havens. We're not back into the argument.
11	We're not in there. Forget about it.
12	MR. KELLER: We're just trying to
13	find
14	JUDGE SIPPEL: This is where you
15	need a lawyer because you are concerned about
16	things that really aren't concerns. This is
17	a prehearing conference. It is not a hearing.
18	There is no testimony being taken. We don't
19	have an evidentiary record even yet, which is
20	what we are trying to put together.
21	MR. HAVENS: All right.

horses. Okay? I've got to get back to this
point. Hold on just a second.
MR. HAVENS: I have that for you
if you would like it.
JUDGE SIPPEL: No, not right now.
Look, Mr. Keller, I have been
distracted in so many ways. Valuation I'm
sorry. Yes. You said second Thursday only
wants to know one or two things. I've been
through second Thursday proceedings before.
They have been successful. And they have
always been a little bit problematical but not
to these proportions.
Nobody really knows what the
ultimate limits of second Thursday are. And
every case is a new case. Every situation is
a new situation.
I don't know if second Thursday is

	MR	. KE	LLER:	There	is	nothin	ıg ir
the	rubrics	of	second	Thur	sday	y and	the
prece	edents of	seco	ond Thur	sday	that	says	that
it's	limited	to	situat	ions	in	which	the
stati	ions are	unde	rvalued.				

JUDGE SIPPEL: No, I didn't say
"undervalued." I didn't say --

MR. KELLER: Or overvalued, for that matter. I mean, but the Bureau seems to be saying that unless they're worth less than the claims are worth, that somehow there is a problem, that if there is going to be any profit at all, that somehow second Thursday no longer applies. I defy anyone to point to a single second Thursday case that says any such thing.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, there is certainly an element of integrity and honesty in any judicial proceeding. I don't think the Commission wants to be having some kind of a slippery deal pulled off on them and send a second Thursday on that basis.

1	MR. KELLER: That's the big deal?
2	We
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I don't know
4	if it's a big deal. I'm just trying to
5	exaggerate obviously to make the point. I
6	mean, you've got to know what's the point
7	is you've got to know what's going on. You
8	know what I'm saying.
9	MR. KELLER: We know what's going
10	on. The parties are willing to make this
11	deal. And those wrongdoers are not going to
12	benefit from it. We don't know for sure.
13	What the licenses are worth is
14	what they can later be sold for. And, as I
15	have often said in this proceeding, I'll
16	guarantee you that if there is a second
17	Thursday grant in this case, a second Thursday
18	approval, then yes, then the licenses are
19	going to be worth a heck of a lot more than
20	they are now.
21	MR. HAVENS: Mr
22	MR. KELLER: Now they're worth

	nothing because of this
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: How do you know
3	that there isn't some deal down the road? I
4	mean, this thing sounds very
5	MR. KELLER: The Commission has
6	addressed that in other cases by placing
7	conditions on there can always be a deal
8	down the road, but the Commission places
9	conditions on
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: Are the Depriests
11	going to be in any line of communication
12	business after this is all over?
13	MR. KELLER: I don't know what
14	they're going to be, but they are certainly
15	going to have absolutely no involvement in
16	these licenses. And there will conditions on
17	the grant to
18	JUDGE SIPPEL: There will be, but
19	
20	MR. HAVENS: Judge Sippel?
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: I don't think you
22	understand what I'm talking about.
ì	l .

1	MR. HAVENS: My companies are in
2	the bankruptcy, sir. May I say one thing?
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: They are?
4	MR. HAVENS: Yes, they are.
5	They're parties in the bankruptcy. Can I
6	address a few things briefly?
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, go ahead.
8	MR. HAVENS: Thank you.
9	The special entities are parties
10	in the bankruptcy. We have attorneys in the
11	bankruptcy. They have always been there.
12	They have reviewed the plan of reorganization,
13	the disclosure plan. We will be making
14	serious objections to both of them. We have
15	an alterative we will be offering to all of
16	the parties, including Maritime, in the
17	bankruptcy. We have comments that I could
18	make or I would have been happy to have our
19	attorneys make on all the arguments, which are
20	arguments, that Mr. Keller is making today.
21	I thought some minutes ago it was

decided to move on to the issue G, which is

1	certainly the finite purpose that Maritime
2	called this hearing, but
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: Maritime didn't
4	call any hearing. I called the hearing. It's
5	not a hearing. It's a conference. And I can
6	cover anything that I think is pertinent to
7	getting the ball down the road a little bit or
8	do they kick the can now or what do they do?
9	MR. HAVENS: Yes, sir. I respect
10	that. I'm sorry. I probably misspoke.
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, you have.
12	And you are wasting time. You can't even come
13	to Washington because you're so busy. And now
14	we're just wasting a bunch of time.
15	MR. HAVENS: I respectfully have
16	stated that my parties are part of the
17	bankruptcy. And we have rights in the
18	bankruptcy. And I stated some facts which I
19	think are relevant.
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes, but then you
21	went into some other you know, you drifted

off of that.

Look, I am very much interested in
what is going on at the bankruptcy. And if
your attorneys down here are going to involve
themselves in the hearing on June 13th and
there are going to be counter-proposals
offered and you have got a justiciable
interest that the bankruptcy court has to
listen to, of course, I am very interested in
that.

But I don't know why you don't have a lawyer. I don't know why you don't have a lawyer up here in the courtroom today talking about this business, instead of you doing it on speakerphone when you've got 18 other things to do down there, out there, wherever you are, California. That's a long way off.

MR. HAVENS: Because the report on bankruptcy status wouldn't have gotten into this.

In addition, on the issue of valuation, there are valuations in the

NEAL R. GROSS

bankruptcy. Those were under protective
order. If the Enforcement Bureau or Your
Honor or other parties would like to see those
valuations submitted by experts we paid for on
the Maritime licenses, then we could make an
appropriate arrangement.
JUDGE SIPPEL: Do you know
anything about that?
MS. KANE: We have not heard
anything about that. And I thought we were
entitled to all of the information that was
being filed in the bankruptcy court because
their protective order is the same as ours.
JUDGE SIPPEL: Do you know
something about this, Mr. Keller?
MR. KELLER: I'm not sure.
JUDGE SIPPEL: The gentleman, Mr.
MR. KELLER: Mr. Reardon knows
something about this. And I stated this.
This is not testimony, but he has some
information about the bankruptcy proceeding,

1	both in his capacity as manager and also as
2	having testified in the hearings and being
3	involved in the hearings that are coming up.
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: This is status
5	information. I know you have a continuing
6	objection to this.
7	MS. KANE: We do have a continuing
8	objection to having Mr. Reardon
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: He's not
10	testifying.
11	MS. KANE: We understand that he
12	is providing information. We have not gotten
13	complete discovery or the opportunity to be
14	able to depose him on any of these issues. So
15	we just have
16	JUDGE SIPPEL: You will have the
17	opportunity to depose him.
18	MS. KANE: We hope to, Your Honor,
19	if we could ever get complete discovery from
20	Maritime.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: Consider this part
22	of your discovery. I know you've got to get

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER, TRANSCRIBER, AND PROOFREADER

Maritime Communicat	ions/Land Mobile, LLC
Name of Hearing	
EB DOCKET NO. 11-71	
Docket No. (if appl	icable)
445 12 th STREET, S.W	., WASHINGTON, D.C.
Place of Hearing	
May 22, 2012	
Date of Hearing	
numbers 520 through complete transcript Sam Wojack identified hearing, the current Federal verbatim reporting verified the accurace comparing the typew recording accomplishinal proofed typew	do hereby certify that the foregoing pages, 675, inclusive, are the true, accurate and prepared from the reporting by (Reporter's Name) in attendance at the above in accordance with applicable provisions of Communications Commission's professional and transcription statement of Work and have by of the accuracy of the transcript by (1) written transcript against the reporting or hed at the hearings and (2) comparing the ritten transcript against the reporting or hed at the hearing or conference. Sam Wojack Legible Name and Signature of Reporter
Date	Name of Company:Neal Gross Vo
May 22, 2012	Sarah Veach Sarah Veach
Date	Legible Name and Signature of Transcriber Name of Company: Neal Gross Co.
May 22, 2012	Tracy Cain
Date	Legible Name and Signature of Proofreader Name of Company:Neal Gross Co